preserve

App. F. IX-4

1928.

File No. 22-28

Previous References

(V.P

Serial Nos. 1—4

Later References

V.P. 43-29 & 3

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. Four.

V.13/4

Part B for April 29.

SUBJECT

Proposal for Tavanella Village panchayat to levy cash pig-in the village cattle 1/ & each small pig. a/- Rs 8.

14

To the Rev. Commissioner
No. A. 0498 dy 3.4.29.
Seeking to sanction the proposal.

MMR 5/4

App. F-III—21.

General and Revenue Secretariat. | V.P. File No. 22 of 192 .

Serial No. 1.

Letter from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District.

No.V.P.771/27-28 dated 24/28th June 1928, received with Revenue Commissioner's Memo C.5827/27-28 of 4th July 1928, recommends that the proposal of the Tavarekere Village Panchayet to tax each 'big' pig in the Village at Re.1/- and each small pig at eight annas may be sanctioned.

1) The Village Panchayet of Tavarekere propose to levy a tax of Re.1/- on each big pig and of Re.0-8-0 as on each small pig in the Village under Section 37 of the Village Panchayet Regulation. The Deputy Commissioner of Tumkur considers that in the interest of better sanitation of the village it is desirable to impose the tax and requests sanction of Government to the levy.

2. Section 37 of the Village Panchayet Regn does not appear to authorise the levy which in this case is not stated to be required for carrying out any specific work or measure. The levy of/tax -- permanently under Section 37 of the Regn. appears to be opposed to the intention of the Legislature. Again, the resolution is not clear as to what pigs should be classified as "big pigs" and what as "small pigs".

3. The Local Self Government Conference of 1923 recommended the levy of a tax on pigs. So far as rural areas are concerned no orders were issued. As regards Municipal areas, Government directed -- that as sections 48 and 137 of the Municipal Regn.

2

App. F. III—2]

ieral and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 22 of 1928.

Serial No.

provided for keeping of swine so as not to be a nuisance. no action was called for (See para 9 of G.O.No. 4527-41 Ml. 145-24-1 dated 23rd December 1924). A section (137 A) was however added to the Municipal Regulation requiring licenses for keepin more than 5 pigs in a City Municipality.

4. The Deputy Commissioner of Tumkur (and the Revenue Commissioner also) recommends that in t interest of better sanitation it is desirable to -- impose a tax (as proposed.) When the levy of a tax (on pigs) was not approved by Government for Municipalities, whether a levy by Panchayets, if the Village Panchayet Regulation authorises it, is expedient, requires consideration.

5. If it is considered ~~desirable~~ expedient to impose restrictions regarding the rearing of swine, action may perhaps be taken under Section 30 of the Villag Panchayet Regn. and rearing of swine declared to be an offensive business. The legal Remembrancer may perhaps be consulted. If action as above proposed could be taken, licenses will have to be (could) for rearing swine and the nuisance therefrom controlled effectively.

6. In this connection, it has to be considered that the levy may press very hard on rearer of swine. As the object of the levy proposed is -- obviously not to discourage the business but to minimise the nuisance therefrom the desired object could be secured by action under Section 30 as proposed in the preceding para. If this is not permissable

proposed is samas to 1 Rega pg. BS

184

3

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 22 of 1928.

Serial No.

permissable, the issue of a rule under clause (9) of Section 65 to the effect that no person should keep swine so as to be a nuisance and declaring a breach of the rule to be an offence punishable under Section 63 (1) (d), may perhaps be the alternative to be adopted.

7 Submitted for orders.

25
14/7/28

8 In this case the imposition of fees on pigs is proposed on the interests of better administration of the village & this is required to be imposed as an additional levy under Sec 37 at one Rupee per pig [illegible] Panchayat Act levy taxes on [illegible] new items as license or other fees. If the discharge of this any of this duty imposed on it is at all, the Panchayat can levy a license fee for rearing of pigs - [illegible] or if this is considered as business can levy a levy under Sec 36. The license fee cannot be with reference to each pig, but it can be only a general fee for each license. In the case of city Chetties only Rs 2 is fixed for a license for keeping [illegible] more than 5 pigs. So the

184 (14) 4

App. F—III—21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

VP File No. 22 of 1928

Serial No.



pigs proposed now are very advantageous. Pigs are in a way sanitary agencies as they remove human excreta. The reason for levying a tax on them in the interests of sanitation does not seem to be very appropriate. Pigs maybe a nuisance in some other ways. eg damage crops for which South pig may be taken under Cattle Trespass Regulation. Govt 2

2nd Member) 28/7/28

Q Ask D.C how many pigs are kept in the village? Are they kept by permanent residents of the village or by wandering gangs of pig breeders? Whether the nuisance caused cannot be met by licencing the occupation under sec 30. An annual tax of Re a head is outrageous.

CSJ 7/8

10 Draft Mr 8/8

11 Draft Submd 8/8/28 HS

12 Sec WD 9/8

Ord
Let me see
Draft copy
Govt reply
VP Rep
CSJ
10/7
Attd with a
Copy of the Regulation
SD

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

154 & 206 / 5

App. F. III—2]

ieral and Revenue Secretariat. | V.P File No. 2 of 192 8

Serial No.

To the D.C. Jumkan Dt
No 1318 of 10-8-28.
calls for additional information
and enquires whether the nuisance
can not be met by licensing the
occupation
from the D.C Jumkan Distt
No VP 729/928 dated 17.1.1929
in reply to 2 above, states that the
enquiry has elicited that there are
30 bigs in the village kept by
permanent residents and that the V.P
are of opinion that the nuisance
caused cannot be met by licensing
the occupation

3 Submitted for orders with reference
to paras 8 & 9 supra

SRR
28/1/29

Chief Secretary
25 JAN. 1929

OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL
28 JAN. 1929
No. 576

28/1/29

I suggest a license fee
of 2 Rs a year if no of pigs kept
is 5 or less, & Rs 2 extra for every
5 pigs more.

31/1/29

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 01714—GPB—30,000—18-4-28

General and Revenue Secretariat

V.P. File No. 22 3286 6 App F. III—2] of 1928-29

Serial No. 16

Two drafts are putup — one a Govt order and another notification — for approval of the orders

GRR. 7/2/29

17 The proposed notification will have the effect of rendering the keeping of pigs a licensable occupation in all rural areas. We have no such stringent rule even in city Municipalities (Vide Section 137A of the Municipal Regulation) and it is feared that the proposed notification may rouse strong public criticism

18 It is perhaps best to drop the matter or if it is thought necessary to make any provision in this respect, a new Section on the lines of section 137 of the Municipal Regulation may be inserted in the Panchayat Regn

(Revenue Member) new 11/2

CJ Please bring up at 4 P.M. CJ 7/2

CHIEF SECRETARY. 8 FEB. 1929

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARIAT COUNCIL 12 FEB. 1929 No. 6120

CHIEF SECRETARY. 7 FEB. 1929

20

A/c to table & return the papers thus

Discussed with Revenue Member today. He gave instructions that the proposal to tax pigs should be dropped. Notification regarding Rabies may be issued.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 021—GPB—30,000—21-8-28

3rd 7

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

VP File No. 92 of 1928-29

Serial No.	
3	A draft letter to the is sub[mitted] for approval directed above GRR. 26/3/29 [illegible] Gen Sec.) 28.3.29
4	To the Revenue Conf no 2 6498 D 3-4-1929 states that Govt are not in favour of sanctioning the proposal the Inbare Kere village Panchayet to levy taxes To the D.C. Tumkur Distt no L 6499 D 3-4-29 Fds a copy of above for[illegible]

GEN. & REV. SECT. 3.4.29 L. & R. BRANCH 7/4/29

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

3rd 7

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | VP File No. 22 of 1928-29

Serial No.

42 A draft letter to the R.C. is subd for approval as directed above

GRR 26/3/29 [illegible]

28.3.29

Gen: Sec:)

Issue RP. 4.4.29. WD

4 To the Revenue Cmr no 2 6498 D. 3-4-1929 states that Govt are not in favor of sanctioning the proposal of the Dubare Hill tribe Panchayet to levy taxes &c

To the D.C. Trichinopoly Dist. no 2 6499 D. 3-4-29 F.S. a copy of above &c

GEN. & R. SECT. 3. APR. 1929 L. & R. BRANCH

7/4/29

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 01714—GPB—30,000—18-4-28

D.C. 8]

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
TUMKUR DISTRICT.

No. VP 771/27-28.

Dated Tumkur, 24th June 1928. *192*

R.223 7.7.28

FROM

K. V. ANANTARAMAN, ESQ., B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District,
Tumkur.

L184 C5827

To

P-G. D'Souza, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Revenue *Muzrai* Commissioner, *in Mysore,*
Bangalore.

OFFICE OF THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER JUN 30 1928 25122 IN MYSORE.

V.P 22-28-1.

SIR,

I have the honour to state that the village Panchayet at Tavarekere have resolved in their meeting held on 14-1-1928 that each pig(big) in their village has to be taxed at Re. 1/- and each small one at annas 8 and request that sanction of Government may be obtained for the levy of this tax under section 37 of the Village Panchayet Regulation.

2. In the interest of better sanitation of the village it is desirable to impose such a tax. I request therefore that sanction of Government may kindly be obtained to impose this tax under section. 37 of the Village Panchayet Regulation.

I have the honour to be

S i r,
Your most obedient servant

S. Kuppanna

For Deputy Commissioner,
Tumkur District.

N.K.

CHIEF SECRETARY. 7 JULY 1928

C 5827/27-28

Memo

Forwarded with Compliments to the Chief Secretary to the Government of H. H. the Maharaja and recommended.

Bangalore Dated 4.7.1928

Revenue Commissioner

9

P. F. VI. G1]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section ~~A-13~~ V.P

File No. 22-25-1

Serial No. 2

No. L 1310

Diary No. of letter replied to.....1814.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To .....The Deputy Commr. Jaffna

Date of issue.....10/8/28.....

Signed by.....Mr. J. 2828.....

Sir,

With ref to your letter no V.P 771/27-28 of 24/28 - 8-28 to the address of the Rev Commr in regard to the levy of a tax of Rupee one on each big pig and of eight annas on each small pig by the Village Panchayet of Tavarekere, I am directed to enquire how many pigs are kept in the village, whether they are kept by permanent

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

over

WD0325—GPB—30,000—26-5-27

10

residents of the village or
by wandering gangs of
Swine-herds and whether
the nuisance caused can
not be met by licensing
the occupation under
Section 30 of the Village
Panchayat Regulation.

I have etc.

S/8

S --- for Govt Secy

10

residents of Hoje village or
by wandering gangs of
some-nerds and whether
the nuisance caused can
not be met by licensing
the occupation under
Section 30 of the Village
Panchayat Regulation
I have en

541

D.C. 3.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
TUMKUR DISTRICT.

5200
No. R.P. 72 9 - 28 - 9 Dated, Tumkur, 17th January 1929.

V.P. 22 - 28 - 3

FROM M.N. Balaraj Urs, Esquure, B.A.,
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Offg: Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, Tumkur.

G.B. & REV. SECT.
L 3206
G 21 JAN. 1929
L. S. G. Bhavan

To

R. Ranga Rao, Esquire, B.A., B.L.

General Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

L184

With reference to your letter No.L. 1318 V.P. 22-28-2 dated 10th August 1928, enquiring how many pigs are kept in the Tavarekere village, Sira Taluk, whether they are kept by permanen residents of the village or by wandering gangs of swine-herds and whether the nuisance caused cannot be met by licensing the occupation under Section 30 of the Village Panchayet Regulation, I have the honor to state that it is learnt on enquiry that there are 30 pigs in the village kept by permanent residents of the village an that the Village Panchayet are of opinion that the nuisance cause cannot be met by licensing the occupation.

I have the honor to be,

sir,

Your most obedient servant,

RR 19/1/29

M.N. Balaraj Urs

Offg: Deputy Commissioner,
Tumkur District.

AD.17/1.

17/1/29

12

Appendix F 6 –1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section P

File No. 22 – 29 –

Serial No. 4

No. L 6498

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

Date of issue 3-4-1929

Signed by Mr. D. K. S. Iyer

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

To The Revenue Commr

Sir,

With reference to the correspondence ending with the Tumkur Deputy Commissioners letter no V.P 729/28-29 dated the 17th January 1929, on the matter of licensing the occupation of Keeping Pigs in the Savarekere village Sira Taluk, I am

over

13

directed to state that
Government are not
in favour of sanctioning
the proposal of the
village Panchayat to
levy taxes on pigs

I have etc

Sd/-
General Secy to Govt
28/3/44

Memo No L6499

Copy of the above is
forwarded with compliments
to the D.C. Trincomalee
for information

Sd/-
Secy to Govt
28/3/44

6/27/2